

REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 30, 2007 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 62-93 are currently pending in the application. Claims 65, 74, 75, 85-88, and 90 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. No new matter has been added. Claims 62-93 are respectfully submitted for consideration.

The Office Action rejected claims 62, 75, 86, 88, 90, and 92-93 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. More specifically, the Office Action took the position that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to a person of skill in the art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Office Action asserted that the limitation of “connecting data transmission traffic simultaneously through the at least two chosen access points,” as recited in the claims, is not supported by the originally filed specification. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the originally filed disclosure provided support for the claimed limitations and, therefore, this rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the reasons which follow.

According to one embodiment of the invention, as discussed in the specification, “it is also possible to choose more than one access for connection at the same time

between the terminal equipment and the host. FIG. 4 shows by way of example a network structure wherein data is transmitted along at least two different routes between terminal equipment TE and the host” (Specification, page 5, lines 20-23). Additionally, according to another example of the invention, the specification provides that traffic may be divided between the accesses in the proportion indicated by the criteria check, so that a certain part of the traffic is relayed through one access and the remaining traffic through another access (Specification, page 7, lines 5-8). The specification also states that “the primary and secondary embodiments of the invention... can also be combined, whereby a choice of at least two accesses at a time is performed in the router in accordance with the primary embodiment of the invention, while the division of traffic between the chosen accesses is performed in accordance with the secondary embodiment of the invention” (Specification, page 7, lines 9-14). As such, Applicants submit that the specification provides ample description and support for the limitation of “connecting data transmission traffic simultaneously through the at least two chosen access points.”

Moreover, originally filed claim 5 specifically recited that “all traffic is connected simultaneously through these at least two chosen access points.” Therefore, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully assert that the subject matter of the claims was clearly described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to a person of skill in the art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 62-93 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Spaur (U.S. Patent No. 6,122,514) in view of Igarashi (U.S. Patent No. 6,952,588). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Applicants submit that this rejection is improper because Igarashi does not constitute a valid prior art reference with respect to the present application. Igarashi has a filing date of October 12, 1999 and claims priority of a Japanese application filed on October 12, 1998. However, the present application claims priority under 35 U.S.C. §119 of Finish application no. 980537 filed on March 9, 1998. Therefore, the present application has a priority date which is prior to both the filing date and foreign priority date of Igarashi. Consequently, Applicants submit that Igarashi cannot be cited as prior art against the present application. Accordingly, this rejection is in error and Applicants respectfully request that it be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed and overcome. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Majid S. AlBassam
Registration No. 54,749

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time